DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 255 CS 208 403

AUTHOR Covner, Thelma Crockin
TITLE The Relationship of Teacher-Personality Type to Grading Freshman Composition Essays: An Empirical Study.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; Individual Differences; Perception; *Personality Assessment; *Personality Traits; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Characteristics; *Writing Evaluation; *Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS *Freshman Composition; Myers Briggs Type Indicator

ABSTRACT

To gain insight into the evaluation of college freshman compositions, a study explored the relationship between the personality type of the instructor and the grades assigned to essays written by freshman composition students. The sample comprised 23 college instructors who answered a short questionnaire, graded the same expository essay, and completed the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Based on Carl Jung's personality typology, the indicator identifies the preferred way an individual perceives (gathers data) and judges (makes decisions). Results showed that instructors whose basic preference was extravert, sensing, thinking, judging, or a combination of these traits, tended to assign higher grades than instructors whose personality types were introvert, intuitive, feeling, perceptive, or a combination of these traits. In addition, the criteria that the instructors claimed to use in evaluating essays differed from those actually used. Finally, neither the length of experience in teaching freshman composition nor faculty status showed any relationship to the grades assigned. (Author/HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED245255

The Relationship of Teacher-Personality Type to Grading Freshman Composition Essays: An Empirical Study

by

Thelma Crockin Covner, M. A.
University of Minnesota, Duluth

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thelma Crockin Covner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 208 403

Copyright Thelma Crockin Covner 1982

Abstract

This study concerns the relationship between the personality type of the instructor and the grades assigned to essays written by Freshman Composition college students. The sample comprised 23 instructors from the Department of English at the University of Minnesota, Duluth who answered a short questionnaire, graded the same expository essay, and took the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Based on Carl Jung's personality typology, the Indicator seeks to identify the preferred way an individual perceives (gathers data) and judges (makes decisions). The essence of Jung's theory is that "much apparently random variation in human behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent, being due to certain basic differences in the way people prefer to use perception and judgment" (Myers 1962).

The results of this study showed that instructors whose basic preference was E (extravert), or S (sensing), or T (thinking), or J (judging), or a combination of these traits, tended to assign higher grades than instructors whose personality types were I (introvert), or N (intuitive), or F (feeling), or P (perceptive), or a combination of these traits. Grades ranged from B- to F. Criteria that the instructors claimed to use in evaluating essays differed from those actually used. Neither the length of experience in teaching Freshman Composition nor faculty status showed any relationship to the grades assigned.

These findings help explain the widespread and prevailing difficulty among English teachers to agree on essay evaluation and grading. They also suggest possible merit in establishing special programs designed to train evaluators, and in considering some form of rating scale (Diederich 1974; Cooper and Odell 1977) to insure more evenness and objectivity in assigning grades, as well as to relieve anxiety and instill confidence in the raters.

Table of Contents

	page
List of Tables	iii
Introduction	1
Procedures and Materials	2 - 6
Results	6 -18
Discussion	18-20
Summary and Conclusions	20-22
Implications	22-23
References	24
Appendix	25

List of Tables

Table		page
1	Essay Grade Distribution	6
2	Grade Distribution According to Single Index of Personality Type	7
3	Instructors Classified According to Single Index of Personality Type	8
4	Average Grades and Myers-Briggs Type Theory	10
5	Instructor Personality Types and the Average Grade They Assigned	11
6	Significance of Average Grade Differences Among Various Type Groups	13

Evaluation of student essays, a knotty component of teaching writing, is generally regarded as perplexing and frustrating. Paul Diederich, creator of the Diederich Rating Scale reflects as a teacher: "The grading was the most difficult, time-consuming, and agonizing part of the whole teaching process. I did not mind writing brief comments . . . but deciding the grade was hard" (Diederich 1974, p. 19).

Over the years interest in the grading of writing has resulted in a number of research studies. Typically more than one evaluator judges the essays on specific writing characteristics. Then, a common denominator is sought among the essays--or, among the judges--to account for the ratings. In an experimental study (Harris 1977) which attempted to determine the basis on which a group of English teachers judged student writing, an interesting paradox emerged. The criteria that the teachers had claimed to be the "most important" did not always influence their evaluations. Frequently, in fact, the criterion used was <u>other than</u> the most important one. Running counter to teacher consensus on specific ideas regarding evaluation, a difference surfaced between supposition and actuality.

How can this contradiction be accounted for? Was the instructors' grading behavior influenced by aspects of their personalities? Although considerable attention has been devoted to teacher personality and its effect on student learning and achievement (Hanke et al. 1971), and studies have explored the relationship between teacher-student

personalities (Weychert 1975), a review of the literature did not yield any data in the area of teacher-personality and grading.

Purpose

The present study sought to explore this area with the objective of obtaining new insights into the evaluation of Freshman Composition writing. The hypothesis was that a relationship exists between the personality type of the instructor and the grades assigned to students' essays.

Procedures and Materials

Subjects

Twenty-three Freshman Composition instructors from the Department of English at the University of Minnesota, Duluth participated. Some were regular faculty members while others were ancillary (part-time) teaching staff which included graduate students and those with the Master's degree. Each person was given a copy of the "Criteria for Grading" (established by the Composition Committee, Department of English) and a copy of the same essay. The instructors agreed to: (1) answer a short questionnaire, (2) grade one expository essay, and (3) take the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Form G).

Appended to this study are samples of all materials.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

A forced choice, self-report questionnaire, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers 1962) seeks to identify the preferred way an individual functions. The Indicator is based on Carl Jung's personality typology: "The gist of the theory is that much apparently random variation in human behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent, being due to certain basic differences in the way people prefer to use perception and judgment" (Myers, p. 1). Although people perceive and judge all the time, individuals tend to use and develop a preferred process. Thus the dominant personality force might be a perceptive process, either Sensing (S) or Intuition (N), a mode of data-gathering that is assisted by a judging process. On the other hand, the dominant force might be a judging process, either Thinking (T) or Feeling (F), a mode of data-processing that is helped by a perceptive process. Hence the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator classifies individuals according to four major dichotomous categories, each assigned to indicate direction or a habitual choice between opposites:

1. Extraversion or Introversion (E-I)

Both groupings reflect how a person orients toward life. This means one's awareness of, and adjustment to, his/her environment which includes time, space, objects or events, and people. The extravert orients primarily outward toward the world of people, events, and things. On the other hand, the introvert orients primarily inward toward the world of ideas. Thus the introvert's perception and judgment are both directed to ideas; the extravert's, to the external environment. Myers (1962) gives examples of

these two orientations: ". . . one who would like to get to the practical application . . . would have the extravert point of view. One who takes more interest in the inner illumination which it may provide for an understanding of himself and human nature in general has the introvert viewpoint" (p. 57).

2. Sensing or Intuition (S-N)

The sensing individual becomes aware, or perceives, by gathering data through his five senses. On the other hand, intuition is indirect perception via the unconscious that serves to heighten conscious awareness with ideas and associations. Thus sensing and intuiting are modes of gathering data as the basis for making judgments and decisions. According to Myers (1962): "When people prefer sensing, they find too much of interest in the actuality around them to spend much energy listening for ideas out of nowhere. When people prefer intuition, they are too much interested in all the possibilities that occur to them to give a lot of notice to the actualities" (pp. 51-52).

3. Thinking or Feeling (T-F)

This category consists of two distinct modes of processing data as the basis of judgments and decisions. Thinking is a logical process which objectively discerns what is true or false. Feeling is a subjective process based on a person's value system. Myers (1962) exemplifies these two ways of

judging: "If . . . one [sic] concentrates on whether or not they [ideas] are true, that is thinking judgment. If one is conscious first of like or dislike, or whether these concepts are sympathetic or antagonistic to other ideas he prizes, that is feeling judgment" (p. 52).

4. Judging or Perceiving (J-P)

This category reflects whether an individual relies primarily on a judging process (thinking or feeling) or on a perceptive process (sensing or intuition) in his dealings with the extraverted part of his life--the outer world. Myers (1962) illustrates the fundamental difference between the two attitudes: "In the judging attitude, in order to come to a conclusion, perception must be shut off for the time being. The evidence is all in. Anything more is incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial. One now arrives at a verdict and gets things settled. Conversely, in the perceptive attitude one shuts off judgment for the time being. The evidence is not all in. There is much more to it than this. New developments will occur. It is much too soon to do anything irrevocable" (p. 58).

Myers (1962) points out that type theory "accords respectful recognition to opposite kinds of people," recognizing each preference as being valuable (p. 3).

Both the direction and the strength of a person's basic preferences are revealed by the scored answer sheet. For example, more points (strength) for E than I would classify that person as an extravert (direction). Conversely, more points for I than E would classify her/him as an introvert. Determining each index in this manner results in a personality that is either E or I; S or N; T or F; J or P. There are sixteen possible combinations of personality type (ENTJ, ISFP, etc.) each with its own distinctive characteristics. Thus, it is possible to classify individuals by using the information gained from combined indicies or from only a single index. According to Myers (1962) both approaches are valid.

Results

Essay Grades

All 23 instructors graded the same expository essay. Table 1 shows the grade distribution.

Table 1

Essay Grade Distribution

Grade	Quality Points	Frequency	% of Distribution
B-	2.7	1	4.3
C+	2.3	1	4.3
C	2.0	3	13.0
C-	1.7	3	13.0
C-/D+	1.5	1	4.3
D+	1.3	1	4.3
D	1.0	7	30.4
F	0.0	6	26.1

With only one rater assigning a high of B- and 13 raters assigning either a D or F, grade distribution was obviously "bottom heavy." The mean (arithmetic average) was 1.126; the mode (the most frequent grade), 1.000; and, the median (the value separating the upper half of the distribution from the lower half) was 1.057. Essentially all were equivalent to a D. Considering the wide range of grades assigned to the same essay by 23 raters, the question arises as to why the dispersion was so high.

Table 2 shows the average grades assigned by each personality type.

Table 2

Grade Distribution According to Single Index of Personality Type

Index	No.	% of Raters	Average Grade
E	10	43.5	1.29
S	4	17.4	1.27
J	15	65.2	1.26
T	16	69.6	1.16
N	19	82.6	1.10
F	7	30.4	1.04
P	8	13.0	1.00
I	13	56.5	1.00

Note that average grades ranged from 1.29 for extraverts (E) to a low of 1.00 for introverts (I) and for perceptive (P) types. When this grade distribution was analyzed statistically by analysis of variance, it was found that there was greater grade variability among the different types than within each single type. This finding was significant at the zero level of confidence, ruling out the possibility of attributing it to chance. Thus, a relationship between instructor personality type and grade assigned was clearly established.

Table 3 compares the grades of raters who were opposite personality types.

Table 3

Instructors Classified According to Single Index of Personality Type

Index	No.	% of Raters	Average Grade
E (extraversion)	10	43.5	1.29
I (introversion)	13	56.5	1.00
S (sensing)	4	17.4	1.27
N (intuitive)	19	82.6	1.10
T (thinking)	16	47.8	1.00
F (feeling)	7	30.4	1.05
J (judging)	15	65.2	1.26
P (perceptive)	8	13.0	1.00

Although the thinking and feeling types graded about the same (1.00 vs 1.05), note that extraverts graded higher than introverts (1.29 vs 1.10), and judging types graded higher than perceptives (1.26 vs 1.00). As a group then, instructors who were either E or S or T or J personality types graded higher than those who were either I or N or F or P types. According to the Scheffe test, the statistical significance of these differences was at the .05 level of confidence. [In light of the evidence, students desirous of high grades would do well to avoid raters who are I, N, F, or P types!]

While the concern of the Indicator is the basic differences in the way people use perception (obtain information) and use judgment (arrive at a decision), the evaluation and grading of essays illustrate this activity. According to Myers-Briggs type theory (Myers, p. 56), the combinations of perception and judgment function as follows:

	ST	SF	NF	NT
People who prefer	SENSING + THINKING	SENSING + FEELING	INTUITION + FEELING	INTUITION + THINKING
focus their attention on	Facts	Facts	Possibilities	Possibilities
and handle these with	Impersonal analysis	Personal warmth	Personal warmth	Impersonal analysis
Thus they tend to be	Practical and matter of fact	Sociable and friendly	Enthusiastic and insightful	Intellectually ingenious

Myers maintains that "behavior is directly affected by the processes of perception and judgment, and it is entirely reasonable that basic differences in perception or judgment should result in corresponding

differences in behavior" (Myers, p. 51).

Arranging the results in Table 3 according to Myers-Briggs Type theory provides the distribution of grades and types shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Average Grades and Myers-Briggs Type Theory

Rater Personality Type	ST	SF	ST/SF	NT	NF	NT/NF
Number of Raters	3	1	4	13	6	19
Average Grade (mean)	1.20	1.30	1.22	1.14	1.00	1.09
Standard Deviation	1.15	0.00	.94	.92	1.00	.82

Because there was only one SF rater, the data for ST and SF types were combined. The ST/SF average of 1.22 was the highest, followed by the NT average of 1.14; then, the NF average of 1.00. According to this application of Myers-Briggs theory, the rater who focuses on facts to obtain information and handles them (makes a decision) either with impersonal analysis or personal warmth (ST/SF types) assigns higher average grades than the rater who focuses on possibilities and handles them with impersonal analysis (NT type). In turn, the latter assigns grades higher than the rater who focuses on possibilities and makes a decision based on personal warmth (NF type).

A comparison of the four ST/SF raters with the 19 NT/NF raters showed that the fact-focusing instructors assigned higher grades than those whose basic preference type favors focusing on possibilities (1.22 vs 1.09). Although these differences indicate a trend consistent with type theory, they are not statistically significant.

Table 5 shows the relationship between the grades assigned by the entire group of 23 instructors and their basic preference or personality types based on all four indices. Note that the INTJ and the INTP were the most frequent types (four each), and the ESTJ, ESFP, and INFP were the least frequent (one each). Out of the sixteen possible Myers-Briggs types, unrepresented were ESFJ, ISFJ, ENFP, ISTP, ISFP, and ESTP. Clearly the intuitive (N) type comprised the majority (82.6%) of the group and the sensing (S) type (17.4%), the minority. Listed also in Table 5 are the average grades assigned by each of the 10 personality types.

Table 5

Instructor Personality Types and the Average Grade They Assigned

Type	No.	Average Grade Assigned
ENTJ	3	2.03
ESTJ	1	1.50
ESFP	1	1.30
INTP	4	1.17
ISTJ	2	1.15
INFP	1	1.00
INFJ	2	1.00
ENFJ	3	1.00
INTJ	4	.75
ENTP	2	.50

Note the broad range of averages from a high of 2.03 for instructors who were ENTJ's to a low of .50 for the ENTP's. Although it is clear that assigned grades varied with the personality type of the rater, the smallness of the various type samples raises the question as to the significance of the differences. Analysis of variance showed greater grade variation among types than within each type group, a finding significant at the .07 level of confidence. Stated another way, there were 93 chances out of 100 that differences among type groups were greater than differences within type groups, indicating a significant relationship between assigned grade and instructor personality type based on four indices.

Additional processing of the Table 5 data pinpointed the differences among groups that were statistically significant. The results, obtained by t tests, are summarized in Table 6. For the first five types listed (ENTJ, ESTJ, ESFP, INTP, ISTJ), the weighted average was 1.445, while that for the remaining five types (INFP, INFJ, ENFJ, INTJ, ENTP) was .833. The difference between them was .61, significant at the .05 level of confidence. Thus evaluators who assigned high ratings graded significantly higher than those who gave lower ratings.

This result is consistent with findings presented earlier. Raters whose preference types were either E or S or T or J assigned higher grades than those raters whose preference types were either I or N or F or P. In the present instance, 65% (13 out of 20) of the single index components of the high graders were E or S or T or J, while the corresponding percentage for the lower raters was 35% (7 out of 20).

Table 6

Significance of Average Grade Differences Among Various Type Groups

Type Group	Difference between Average Grades	t	Confidence Level
(ENTJ, ESTJ, ESFP, INTP, ISTJ vs (INFP, INFJ, ENFJ, INTJ, ENTP	.61	1.789	.05
(ENTJ, ESTJ vs (ESFP, INTP, ISTJ, INFP	.74	1.440	.05
(ESFP, INTP, ISTJ vs (INFJ, ENFJ, INTJ, ENTP	.35	2.313	.025
(ESTJ vs (ENFJ, INTJ, ENTJ	1.25	1.885	.05
(ESTJ vs (INTJ, ENTP	1.36	1.753	.10
(ENTJ, ESTJ vs (ESFP, INTP, ISTJ	.81	1.470	.10
(ENTJ vs (ESTJ	.53	.987	ns
(ENTJ, ESTJ vs (ESFP, INTP	.70	1.355	ns

t = tests for significance of difference

ns = not statistically significant

Table 6 also shows other significant differences such as:

.74 between the top two, ENTJ, ESTJ, and the next four, ESFP, INTP, ISTJ, INFP--significant at the .05 level;

.35 between ESFP, INTP, ISTJ and the bottom four, INFJ, ENFJ, INTJ, ENTP--significant at the .025 level;

1.25 between ESTJ, the second highest, and the bottom three, ENFJ, INTJ, ENTP--significant at the .05 level;

1.36 between ESTJ and the lowest two, INTJ, ENTP--significant at the .01 level;

.81 between ENTJ, ESTJ and the next three, ESFP, INTP, ISTJ--
significant at the .05 level.

Note also that the .53 difference between the two highest, ENTJ and ESTJ, was not significant. The same was true for the .70 difference between the two highest, ENTJ, ESTJ and the next two, ESFP, INTP.

The Questionnaire

In addition to information derived from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, the short questionnaire filled out by the 23 participants provided further data. It dealt with the extent to which the following features influenced the raters:

(1) knowing that the essay was a revised one
(2) considering the "Criteria for Grading"
(3) the student's knowledge or grasp of his subject
(4) the student's ability to get his message understood by his audience
(5) years of experience in teaching Freshman Composition
(6) regular faculty vs ancillary faculty status.

For the first four variables, the raters assigned 1, 2, or 3 value points, using 3 for highest, 1 for lowest, and 2 for moderate. Listed below are the resulting average scores which range from moderate to moderate-plus:

2.13 for knowing that the essay was a revised one;
2.22 for considering the "Criteria for Grading";
2.00 for the student's grasp of his subject;
2.43 for the message getting across to the audience.

The remaining variables were demographic in nature. The average experience in teaching Freshman Composition was 2.56 years. Of the 23 participants, 13 (56.5%) were regular faculty members, and the remaining 10 (43.5%) were ancillary staff.

The main issues regarding these findings were relationship to the grades assigned and the significance of the relationship. The latter was determined by t tests, illustrated below:

Influence of knowing that the essay was a revised one.

Value Point Group	No. of Raters	Average Essay Grade	Differences in Essay Grades Among Value Point Groups		t	Confidence Level
1	6	.95				
2	8	1.34	2 vs 1:	.39	.726	ns
3	9	1.05	2 vs 3:	.29	.643	ns

Note that the raters who attached moderate rather than low or high value points assigned the highest average grade, 1.34. The difference of .39 between the raters who assigned one and two value points was not significant. Neither was the .29 difference between those who assigned two and three points statistically significant. In brief, knowing that the student's essay was a revised version appears to show no significant bearing upon the grades assigned by the instructors.

Influence of "Criteria for Grading."

Value Point Group	No. of Raters	Average Essay Grade	Differences in Essay Grades Among Value Point Groups		t	Confidence Level
1	7	.957				
2	4	1.675	2 vs 1:	.718	1.136	.15 ns
3	12	1.040	2 vs 3:	.635	1.351	.10

Here the highest average grade was assigned by those who gave a moderate (2 point value) response. The difference between the average grades for these raters and those who responded with a low value was .718 which approached significance at the .15 level of confidence. The .635 difference between the average grades of the instructors who gave two and three points to the degree of criteria influence was significant at .10 confidence level. In sum, raters who claimed to be moderately influenced by the official grading criteria assigned higher grades than those instructors who claimed high or low influence.

Findings dealing with the student writer are shown below:

Student's grasp of his subject.

Value Point Group	No. of Raters	Average Essay Grade	Differences in Essay Grades Among Value Point Groups	t	Confidence Level
1	7	1.17			
2	9	1.444	2 vs 1: .274	.404	ns
3	7	.671	2 vs 3: .773	.773	ns
1+2	16	1.325	1+2 vs 3: .654	1.753	.05

The raters who attached moderate value to the student's subject grasp have the highest average essay grade. However, its superiority to the average grade assigned by those who claimed low value was not significant. Also not significant was the difference in average grade between those who gave a moderate and high value. Combining the value point groups that gave low and moderate value and comparing them with the high value point group resulted in a difference

between the essay grades they assigned, significant at the .05 confidence level. Thus, the higher the value assigned to the student's having a grasp of his subject, the lower the grade.

Audience understanding.

Value Point Group	No. of Raters	Average Essay Grade	Differences in Essay Grades Among Value Point Groups	t	Confidence Level
1	1	1.70			
2	11	.945	1 vs 2: .755	.980	ns
3	11	1.391	2 vs 3: .456	1.093	ns

There was no evidence that essay grades were influenced by the concept of a writer having his message clearly understood by his audience.

Information from the demographic items on the questionnaire are shown below:

Teaching experience.

Years	No. of Instructors	Average Essay Grade	Differences in Essay Grades Among Years of Experience	t	Confidence Level
under 1	3	1.00			
1 - 2	4	.85	1 vs. 2: .15	.220	ns
3 and more	16	1.17	2 vs 3: .32	.599	ns

Here the differences among the groups of instructors and the assigned grades were very small and not statistically significant. Thus, no relationship was demonstrated between the years of Freshman Composition teaching experience and essay grading.

Faculty status.

Status Group	No. of Instructors	Average Essay Grade	Differences in Essay Grades Between Staff Status		t	Confidence Level
Regular	13	1.20				
Ancillary	10	1.03	1 vs 2:	.17	.48	ns

There was no evidence of a significant relationship between faculty status and the grade assigned to the student's essay.

Discussion

Results of this investigation support the hypothesis that a relationship exists between teacher personality and grades assigned to essays written by Freshman Composition students.

The findings of this study provide insights into behaviors that take place during the process of grading essays. Evidence suggests that instructors who assigned relatively high grades and who were the following personality types tended to:

. extraverts	(E)	orient outwardly toward life (people, events and things), to practical application
. sensing	(S)	become aware through the senses and focus on facts and what is happening
. thinking	(T)	discern what is true or false (correct or incorrect) in a logical, orderly way
. judging	(J)	arrive at a decision based on information at hand (perceived) by shutting off their perceptive process

In contrast, relatively low grades were assigned by instructors designated as the following personality types who tended to:

. introverts	(I)	orient primarily inward, directing both their perception and judgment to ideas
. intuitive	(N)	explore possibilities due to their intuition (indirect or unconscious perception) tacking on ideas and associations to what they perceived consciously, thus heightening their awareness
. feeling	(F)	make decisions subjectively based on their value system, the degree of importance they attach to matters or things
. perceptive	(P)	rely heavily on information, shutting off their judging process temporarily in order to wait for more evidence or new developments to occur

Grading behaviors associated with various personalities may help account for the unexplained variance in grades noted in Diederich's (et al, 1961) study on essay grading. Sixty raters, among them ten college English teachers, assigned grades to 300 essays. Diederich states that each essay received as many as five different grades from the readers. (In the present study, the student's essay received seven different grades from 23 readers.) Although the method of factor analysis explained 43% of the variability in Diederich's study, the remaining 57% remained a puzzle. Diederich concluded that not all causes can be measured by factor analysis and cited two examples: "unique ideas about grading that are not shared by any other reader," and "random variations in judgment, which may be regarded as errors in judgment" (p. 10). An alternate explanation may

be Jung's personality typology on which the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is based: ". . . much apparently random variation in human behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent, being due to certain basic differences in the way people prefer to use perception and judgment" (Myers, p. 1). This may also shed light on the contradictions that Harris (1977) encountered in her study which held true here as shown by the questionnaire findings.

The size and composition of the instructor sample in the present study may have influenced the results considerably. For instance, the N (intuitive) classification comprised 82.6% of the total sample. Yet within that classification were seven sub-categories. Also, the S (sensing) classification which was only 17.4% of the entire sample contained three sub-categories. Hence the significance of differences among these numerous and varied groupings may have been affected by the smallness of the many type samples. Noteworthy, too, was the "bottom heavy" grade distribution which deviated sharply from a normal distribution in which grades tend to "pile up in the middle" (the bell-shaped curve). Because most statistical formulas are based on a normal distribution, the significance of the results may have been suppressed. Despite this limitation, however, significant differences did emerge in the present study.

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to learn about the relationship between teacher-personality and grading. The hypothesis was that a relationship exists between the personality type of the instructor and the grades assigned to student essays. It was hoped that this

investigation would provide insights into the evaluation and grading of essays written by Freshman Composition students.

Participants were 23 Freshman Composition instructors from the Department of English at the University of Minnesota, Duluth. They answered a short questionnaire, graded the same expository essay, and took the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Form G).

The Indicator seeks to identify the preferred way an individual functions and is based on Carl Jung's personality typology: "The gist of the theory is that much apparently random variation in human behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent, being due to certain basic differences in the way people prefer to use perception and judgment " (Myers, p. 1). Hence the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator classifies individuals according to their preferred modes of perceiving (data-gathering) and judging (decision-making).

Appended to this study are samples of all materials: the questionnaire, the essay, the "Criteria for Grading" and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Form G).

The following conclusions appear warranted:

1. Results of this study supported the hypothesis.
2. Criteria which instructors claimed to use in assigning grades differed from those actually used.
3. Variation in grading was associated with differences in the way instructors perceived and judged the essay.
4. Instructors whose basic preference was E (extravert) or

S (sensing) or T (thinking) or J (judging), or a combination of these traits, tended to assign higher grades than instructors who were I (introverts) or N (intuitive) or F (feeling) or P (perceptive) preference types.

5. Depending on the individual rater, personal grading did not insure objectivity, fairness, or constancy.
6. Neither faculty status nor length of experience in teaching Freshman Composition showed a relationship to the grades assigned.

Implications

The findings of this study confirmed the classic joke that "the same composition will receive different grades if submitted to different instructors" (Thompson, p. 1). According to Myers (1962), it is generally true that English teachers in liberal arts colleges are predominantly NF personality types. In this study, the intuitives (N) comprised the majority of the total sample. They were among the low graders, contrasting with the high graders that were E, S, T, or J's. From what we have learned about the behaviors of these various raters, the latter were practical, factual, logical, and decisive. It would appear that they characteristically exercise objectivity in decision-making. Perhaps these personality type differences shed some light on the widespread and prevailing difficulty among English teachers to agree on essay evaluation and grading. Also, the findings suggest that there may be merit in programs especially designed to train evaluators.

Crucial to evaluation is clarification of purpose. In assigning a grade, is the instructor using it as a reward or as a means to motivate the student to work harder? If indeed the grade represents an evaluation of the student's writing, then certain qualitative standards and criteria should be established at the onset. It would be desirable, for instance, to reach a consensus on the amount of emphasis or weighting to be attached to specific features: the student's grasp of his subject; getting his message across to the audience; correctness of form as designated in the official "Criteria for Grading."

But this study has shown that consensus does not necessarily insure adherence, constancy, or evenness. A helpful device for analyzing the writing of college freshmen appears to be the Diederich Rating Scale (1974) which furnishes the rater with a description of, and the points given to, the essay's main features (content, organization, and mechanics). This is only one example among a number of alternatives (Cooper and Odell 1977; Diederich 1974) that might be considered as an aid to essay evaluation and grading. Such a scale (or an adaptation thereof) might alleviate grading anxiety, instill confidence in raters, achieve objectivity, and insure more evenness in assigning grades.

References

Cooper, Charles R. and Lee Odell. Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977.

Diederich, Paul. Measuring Growth in English. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Hanke, John E., Samuel R. Houston and Richard Usher. "Researching the Effective College Teacher: A Perceptual Approach." Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education, 9, No. 2, Winter 1971.

Harris, Winifred H. "Teacher Response to Student Writing: A Study of the Response Patterns of High School English Teachers to Determine the Basis for Teacher Judgment of Student Writing." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 2, 1977.

Myers, Isabel Briggs. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Manual 1962, 4th printing. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Thompson, Richard F. "Predicting Writing Quality." English Studies Collections, Inc., 1, No. 7, 1976.

Weychert, Sister Maria Cornelia. "The Effects of Similarity-Dissimilarity of Student-Teacher Personality Type on Student Attitude and Achievement." Ph.D. Dissertation. Temple University, 1975.